

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated June 9, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. A petition for a one-month extension of time accompanies this Amendment. Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein; and claims 18-23 have been added. No new matter has been introduced by the new claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Claim for Foreign Priority

At the outset, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the Applicants' claim for foreign priority as well as receipt of all the priority documents. The Applicants request that the acknowledgment of the priority documents be made in the next Office correspondence.

II. Telephone Interview

The Applicants thank Examiner Phantana-Angkool for granting the interview with the Applicants' representative, which was conducted on October 2, 2009. During the interview, the distinguishable features between the present invention (as recited in new independent claim 18) and the cited prior art were discussed in detail.

It was noted that the present invention (as recited in independent claim 18) is distinguishable from the cited prior art in that a conversion section is configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from an event related to GUI content displayed on the display screen by the GUI player into an event interpretable for an application. The conversion rule associates the event related to the GUI content with the event interpretable for the application. Thus, a designer who designs the GUI player (the screen section) and a programmer who designs the application (the control section) will be able to design freely without being constrained (see e.g., ¶ [0017] of the Applicants' disclosure).

On the other hand, it was noted that the cited prior art does not include a description concerning a conversion section configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from an event related to GUI content displayed on the screen by the GUI player into an event interpretable for the application, wherein the conversion rule associates the event related to the GUI content with the event interpretable for an application.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner acknowledged the differences between the present invention and the cited prior art and indicated that further consideration of the new claims would be given upon the filing of a response to the Office Action.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts (U.S. Patent No. 5,801,696, hereafter “Roberts”) in view of Whittenberger (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0176967, hereafter “Whittenberger”). The Applicants have canceled claims 1-17, thereby rendering the above rejection to those claims moot. Additionally, the Applicants assert that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of independent claims 18, 22 and 23. Independent claim 18 recites the following features:

“[a] display process apparatus comprising:
an application;
a display screen;

a GUI player configured to display, on said display screen, a GUI content used by said application; and

a conversion section configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from an event related to the GUI content displayed on said display screen by said GUI player into an event interpretable for said application, the conversion rule associating the event related to the GUI content with the event interpretable for the application,

wherein the application processes the event related to said GUI player by using the conversion rule.” (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 18 are similarly recited in independent claims 22 and 23. That is, independent claims 22 and 23 are corresponding method and program claims (respectively); and both claims recites steps directed to the features of the apparatus of claim 18. Additionally, the features noted above in independent claim 18 (and similarly recited in independent claims 22 and 23) are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (e.g., ¶ [0014] and ¶ [0017]).

Conventionally, a GUI player (a screen section) controlled by a designer and an application (a control section) controlled by a programmer are designed such that the GUI player and the control section are mutually constrained by one another. That is, modifying the design of

either the GUI player or the application affects the design of the other. Thus, neither the GUI player (the screen section) nor the application (the control section) can be easily applied to another system.

According to the present invention (as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23), a conversion section is configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from an event related to the GUI content displayed on the screen by the GUI player into an event interpretable for the application. The conversion rule associates the event related to the GUI content with the event interpretable for the application. Thus, for example, a designer who designs the GUI player (the screen section) is not constrained by the programmer who designs the application (the control section).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Roberts in view of Whittenberger for disclosing or suggesting all the features of the present invention. However, the Applicants assert that Roberts in view of Whittenberger fails to disclose or suggest the features now recited in at least new independent claims 18, 22 and 23.

Roberts discloses a data processing system arranged to run a plurality of applications, wherein each application is associated with one or more windows and each window is under the control of a user interface provided by the system.

Additionally, Whittenberger discloses a method for providing a user interface for mapping entities between a plurality of business applications in an integrated business solutions computing environment.

However, neither Roberts nor Whittenberger discloses or suggests a conversion section configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from an event related to GUI content displayed on the screen by a GUI player into an event interpretable for an application, wherein the conversion rule associates the event related to the GUI content with the event interpretable for the application, as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23 (as amended).

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Roberts and Whittenberger would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 18, 22 and 23. Additionally, no combination of Roberts and Whittenberger would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 19-21 at least by virtue of their dependencies (directly or indirectly) from independent claim 18.

Moreover, the Applicants also assert that dependent claim 19 is distinguishable from Roberts and Whittenberger on its own merit.

Generally, there is provided a rule for generating a GUI content per GUI. Therefore, there arises a problem in which the GUI content and the GUI player, which are generated specifically for a certain system, cannot be used for developing an application for another system (see e.g., ¶ [0006] of the Applicants' disclosure).

The present invention, as recited in claim 19, modifies the GUI player by updating the conversion rule to another conversion rule. Therefore, the GUI content and the GUI player, which are generated specifically for a certain system, can be used for developing an application for another system.

Thus, in the field of application development, it becomes possible for a GUI content and a GUI player, which are generated and developed (respectively) for another system, to realize a GUI of an application that is under development. Further, updating the GUI content and the GUI player allows a GUI of an application, which is under development, to be modified without modifying the application. By this, reusability of the existing application will be improved thereby realizing an improvement in efficiency of application development as well as a cost reduction of application development (see e.g., ¶ [0051] of the Applicants' disclosure).

The above features of claim 19 are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art. Accordingly, dependent claim 19 is distinguished from Roberts and Whittenberger (individually or in combination) on its own merit.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Hidehiko SHIN et al.

By /Mark D. Pratt/
2009.10.09 11:10:31 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ekb
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 9, 2009